



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Pehr Jansson  
Pehr Jansson's Law Firm  
7628 Parkview Circle  
Austin TX 78731-1127

In re Application of	:	
Akkar et al.	:	
Application No.: 10/520,806	:	DECISION
PCT No.: PCT/IB03/03120	:	
Int. Filing Date: 07 July 2003	:	ON
Priority Date: 09 July 2002	:	
Attorney Docket No.: 76.0726/PR	:	PETITION
For: Method To Secure An Electronic Assembly	:	
Against Attacks By Error Introduction	:	

This is a decision on applicants' "Reconsideration Request For Petition Under 37 CFR 1.182" filed on 26 November 2007.

### DISCUSSION

In a Decision mailed on 01 October 2007, the previous "petition under 37 CFR 1.182" was dismissed without prejudice because, under 37 CFR 1.8(b),

Regarding requirement (3), petitioner has not provided an appropriate statement, made on the basis of first-hand knowledge, attesting to the timely transmission of the reply. Specifically, petitioner should provide a statement from his "former partner" attesting to the facts surrounding the alleged transmission of the reply. For this reason, the submitted docket sheets do not satisfy requirement (3).

Though petitioner has requested treatment under 37 CFR 1.182, this petition is does not require treatment under 37 CFR 1.182. Therefore, the \$400.00 petition fee paid on 08 August 2007 is being refunded to Deposit Account No. 50-2299, as authorized by the Transmittal Letter filed on 10 January 2005.

The \$400.00 petition fee was refunded as not required.

In response, petitioner has provided a "Statement of Timely Transmission of Reply" signed by Jennifer A. Beasley, which satisfies 37 CFR 1.8(b)(3). All of the requirements of 37 CFR 1.8(b) having been satisfied, the 09 August 2007 "additional copy" of the correspondence originally filed on 13 June 2006 would be acceptable as a timely reply to the Notification of Missing Requirements mailed on 13 April 2006.

Further review of the record reveals that an acceptable declaration was filed under PCT Rule 4.17(iv). Therefore, the surcharge under 37 CFR 1.492(h) referenced in the Form PCT/DO/EO/905 mailed on 13 April 2006 was not required. In addition, petitioner paid a \$400.00 petition fee under 37 CFR 1.182 on 26 November 2007, but said fee is not required, and accordingly it is being refunded.

**DECISION**

The petition is **GRANTED**, to the extent noted above.

This application is being forwarded to the Office of Patent Application Processing for further processing. Its date under 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1), (2) and (4) is **10 January 2005**.



George Dombroske  
PCT Legal Examiner  
Office of PCT Legal Administration  
Tel: (571) 272-3283  
Fax: (571) 273-0459